

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 09469 211816Z  
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00  
INRE-00 ACDE-00 /026 W  
-----013426 211821Z /50  
P 211758Z JUN 78  
FM USMISSION GENEVA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1186  
INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW  
USMISSION USNATO

S E C R E T GENEVA 09469

EXDIS

USSALTTWO

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1  
TAGS: PARM  
SUBJECT: QUESTIONS BY SEMENOV DURING POST-PLENARY  
- DISCUSSIONS, JUNE 21, 1978 (SALT TWO-1792)

1. THE FOLLOWING IS TEXT OF QUESTIONS POSED BY SEMENOV  
DURING POST-PLENARY DISCUSSION ON JUNE 21, 1978.

2. MR. AMBASSADOR, IN THE COURSE OF OUR POST-PLENARY  
CONVERSATION ON JUNE 14, 1978, YOU SPOKE TO THE EFFECT  
THAT, IF A GIVEN CRUISE MISSILE WERE SUBJECT TO EITHER  
OF THE TWO CRITERIA YOU NAMED, IT WOULD BE CONSIDERED AS  
HAVING A RANGE IN EXCESS OF 600 KILOMETERS.

THE QUESTION ARISES, HOWEVER--WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP  
BETWEEN THE TWO CRITERIA YOU HAVE NAMED, WHEREIN DO THEY  
DIFFER OR COINCIDE? IS IT CORRECT TO UNDERSTAND THAT THE  
DISTANCE IMPLIED IN THE FIRST CASE AS A LIMIT ON CRUISE  
MISSILE RANGE MUST NOT EXCEED THE DISTANCE REFERRED TO IN  
THE SECOND CASE? AN ANALYSIS OF WHAT WAS SAID BY THE U.S.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 09469 211816Z

DELEGATION AT THE JUNE 14, 1978 MEETING CREATES THE  
IMPRESSION THAT THE SECOND CRITERION ACTUALLY INTERPRETS  
THE FIRST CRITERION BY MAKING IT MORE SPECIFIC, DIVIDING  
IT, SO TO SPEAK, INTO ITS COMPONENT ELEMENTS. IS SUCH  
AN UNDERSTANDING CORRECT?

3. WHAT IS THE MEANING OF THE WORDS "FULL SYSTEM," AS

USED BY THE U.S. DELEGATION WITH RESPECT TO THE NEW PROPOSAL?

4. THE U.S. DELEGATION MENTIONED A SO-CALLED FUEL RESERVE. IN THIS CONNECTION, MENTION IS MADE TO NOT INCLUDING THE ADDITIONAL DISTANCE THE MISSILE COULD FLY IF IT USED THIS RESERVE. STILL, ACCORDING TO YOUR APPROACH, WHAT WOULD BE THE DISTANCE TO BE COVERED BY THE MISSILE, FOR WHICH SUCH A RESERVE WOULD BE DESIGNED IF, SAY THE FLIGHT OF THE MISSILE WERE TO TAKE PLACE UNDER AVERAGED CONDITIONS? TO CLARIFY MY THOUGHT: LET US ASSUME THAT AT A GIVEN MOMENT DURING ITS FLIGHT THE CRUISE MISSILE HAS NO FUEL OTHER THAN THE RESERVE. AS FOR THE OTHER FLIGHT CONDITIONS, LET US ASSUME THAT THEY ARE CALM, I.E., THERE IS NO WIND--NEITHER A CROSS-WIND, NOR WIND ALONG THE FLIGHT TRAJECTORY, NOR AT AN ANGLE TO IT. HOW FAR COULD A CRUISE MISSILE FLY USING SUCH A FUEL RESERVE? HOW WOULD THIS BE EXPRESSED IN KILOMETERS? OR, IF YOU PREFER, IN MILES?

5. THE SOVIET DEFINITION OF CRUISE MISSILE RANGE IMPLIES BY THE "MAXIMUM DISTANCE WHICH CAN BE COVERED BY THE MISSILE" 600 AND 2,500 KILOMETERS RESPECTIVELY. THE U.S. DELEGATION HAS REFERRED TO AN AGREED PERCENTAGE IN EXCESS OF ESTABLISHED RANGE LIMITS. IT FOLLOWS FROM THE EXPLANATIONS GIVEN BY YOUR SIDE AT THE DRAFTING GROUP MEETING ON MONDAY, JUNE 15, THAT THIS PERCENTAGE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 GENEVA 09469 211816Z

WOULD ACCOMMODATE THE MAXIMUM SWING OF A CRUISE MISSILE'S HORIZONTAL MANEUVERS. HOWEVER, WHAT IS THE MAGNITUDE OF THE PERCENTAGE YOU HAVE IN MIND?

6. AS YOU KNOW, ACCORDING TO THE APPROACH ON WHICH WE HAVE ALREADY AGREED, THE DRAFT TREATY AND PROTOCOL THERETO UNDER NEGOTIATION DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN CRUISE MISSILES BY BASING MODE, NAMELY CRUISE MISSILES ON BOMBERS, CRUISE MISSILES ON SEA-BASED LAUNCHERS AND CRUISE MISSILES ON LAND-BASED LAUNCHERS. IN OTHER WORDS, THERE IS NO MENTION OF DIFFERENTIATING ON THE BASIS OF THE TARGETS AGAINST WHICH CRUISE MISSILES ARE USED. NEVERTHELESS, THE U.S. DELEGATION'S STATEMENT AT THE JUNE 14 MEETING ESPECIALLY SINGLES OUT CRUISE MISSILES "DEVELOOED AND TESTED FOR ANTI-SHIP MISSIONS."

THIS IS SOMETHING NEW. AND IT IS IN CONFLICT WITH THE AGREED APPROACH I HAVE MENTIONED. INCIDENTALLY, HOWEVER, WHAT CRUISE MISSILES IN TERMS OF THEIR BASING MODE ARE MEANT WHEN YOU SPEAK OF CRUISE MISSILES "DEVELOPED AND TESTED FOR ANTI-SHIP MISSIONS?"

7. IN VIEW OF THE FACT THAT WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF

THE U.S. APPROACH DIFFERENT VARIANTS ARE PROPOSED TO  
RESOLVE THE DEFINITION OF CRUISE MISSILE RANGE, DEPENDING  
UPON THE TARGET AGAINST WHICH A CRUISE MISSILE IS USED,  
DOES THIS NOT MEAN, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT AS APPLIED TO  
CRUISE MISSILES WHICH, AS YOU SAY, ARE "DEVELOPED AND  
TESTED FOR ANTI-SHIP MISSIONS," YOU HAVE IN MIND A  
DIFFERENT MAGNITUDE FOR THE PERCENTAGE ALLOWANCE ABOVE  
THE ESTABLISHED RANGE LIMIT, AS COMPARED TO OTHER CRUISE  
MISSILES? END TEXT. EARLE

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** Z  
**Capture Date:** 01 jan 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** TEXT, DISARMAMENT, MEETING REPORTS, MEETINGS, DIPLOMATIC DISCUSSIONS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 21 jun 1978  
**Decaption Date:** 20 Mar 2014  
**Decaption Note:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 20 Mar 2014  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1978GENEVA09469  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** X1  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** D780259-0221  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** GENEVA USSALTTWO  
**Handling Restrictions:**  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1978/newtext/t19780637/aaaabfnh.tel  
**Line Count:** 124  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Message ID:** 268fb784-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ACTION SS  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 28 jun 2005  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 2269724  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** QUESTIONS BY SEMENOV DURING POST-PLENARY - DISCUSSIONS, JUNE 21, 1978 (SALT TWO-1792)  
**TAGS:** PARM, (SEMENOV)  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkgvwkey:** odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/268fb784-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Sheryl P. Walter  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
20 Mar 2014  
**Markings:** Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014